ACADEMIC JOURNAL VOL.1.0- ISSUE 1

OXBRIDGE®

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF INTERDISCIPLINARY RESEARCH

A COMMON GROUND FOR INTERDISCIPLINARY SCHOLARSHIP

OXBRIDGE® PUBLISHING UK International Journal of Interdisciplinary Research

Algorithmic Decision-Making Systems and Legal Responsibility: Reconstructing Fault, Agency, and Accountability in the Digital Age

Sezi Sıdal, LL.B.
Istanbul University, Faculty Of Law
Istanbul, Turkiye
sezisidal@gmail.com
ORCID: 0009-0004-4087-616X

Abstract

In the digital age, algorithmic decision-making systems have become central actors in shaping legal, economic, and social outcomes. From credit scoring and insurance risk assessments to welfare allocation, content moderation, and predictive policing, algorithmic systems increasingly determine individuals' access to rights, resources, and visibility. This transformation poses a fundamental challenge to classical legal concepts such as agency, fault, responsibility, and accountability, which are traditionally grounded in human intention and consciousness. While legal doctrine presumes a human decision-maker capable of intent, negligence, and moral judgment, algorithmic systems operate through opaque, data-driven processes that defy these assumptions. This article examines the legal nature of algorithmic decision-making systems from a doctrinal and legal-philosophical perspective. It argues that existing fault-based liability regimes are structurally inadequate to address algorithmic harms and proposes a reconceptualization of legal responsibility grounded in human dignity, transparency, and systemic accountability. The study ultimately advances the concept of "algorithmic accountability" as a normative framework capable of preserving the protective function of law in the digital era.

Keywords: Algorithmic decision-making, legal responsibility, fault, human dignity, digital law, artificial intelligence

1. Introduction: Law Confronts the Algorithmic Turn

Law has historically been constructed around the regulation of human conduct. Legal norms presuppose a subject endowed with will, intention, and the capacity for rational choice. The foundational concepts of agency and responsibility are inseparable from this anthropocentric ontology. However, the rapid expansion of algorithmic decision-making systems fundamentally destabilizes these assumptions. Decisions once made by identifiable human actors are now increasingly delegated to automated systems operating through statistical inference, pattern recognition, and machine learning.

Copyright © OXBRIDGE UK - International Journal of Interdisciplinary Research

This transformation is not merely technical but profoundly normative. Algorithmic decisions shape life chances by determining who receives credit, employment opportunities, social assistance, or visibility in digital public spaces. Yet these systems often function as "black boxes," rendering their internal logic inaccessible even to their designers (Pasquale, 2015). The result is a growing disjunction between legal responsibility and social power.

The central question of this article is therefore not whether algorithms can be blamed in a moral sense, but how law can meaningfully respond to harms produced by systems that escape traditional categories of fault and agency. Addressing this question requires rethinking the conceptual foundations of legal responsibility in the digital age.

2. The Legal Nature of Algorithmic Decision-Making Systems

From a legal standpoint, algorithmic systems occupy an ambiguous position. On the one hand, they are designed, deployed, and maintained by human actors; on the other, they exhibit operational autonomy, learning capacities, and outcome unpredictability. Traditional legal doctrine tends to classify algorithms as mere tools, comparable to technical instruments used by human agents. However, this analogy is increasingly untenable. Machine learning systems do not simply execute predefined instructions; they generate decision rules dynamically based on data correlations. As a result, the causal chain between human intent and algorithmic outcome is often fragmented or opaque. Scholars have therefore suggested that algorithms function as "normative intermediaries," shaping behavior and outcomes without being recognized as legal actors (Binns, 2018). This hybridity creates a legal vacuum. Algorithms are not legal subjects and thus cannot bear responsibility, yet treating them as neutral tools obscures their decisive role in producing harm. Law must therefore develop conceptual tools capable of addressing this intermediate status without resorting to fictional personhood.

3. The Anthropocentric Structure of Fault and Its Limits

Fault-based liability constitutes one of the cornerstones of modern legal systems. Concepts such as intent (mens rea), negligence, and foreseeability presuppose a conscious subject capable of understanding and controlling the consequences of their actions. Algorithmic systems, however, lack consciousness, intention, and moral awareness.

Nevertheless, the harms produced by algorithmic decisions are neither accidental nor insignificant. Empirical studies have demonstrated how algorithmic systems reproduce and amplify structural biases embedded in training data, leading to discriminatory outcomes in areas such as policing, hiring, and credit allocation (O'Neil, 2016; Eubanks, 2018).

The insistence on fault as a prerequisite for liability risks rendering these harms legally invisible. As a result, some scholars advocate a shift toward objective or strict liability regimes for algorithmic harms, emphasizing risk creation rather than subjective intent (Hildebrandt, 2015). Such an approach aligns with the broader function of law as a mechanism for harm prevention and rights protection.

Copyright © OXBRIDGE UK - International Journal of Interdisciplinary Research

4. Distributed Responsibility and the Responsibility Gap

Algorithmic decision-making systems are embedded within complex socio-technical ecosystems involving multiple actors: software developers, data providers, platform operators, public authorities, and end-users. This distributed architecture complicates the attribution of responsibility.

The concept of the "responsibility gap" captures this dilemma, referring to situations in which harmful outcomes occur without a clearly identifiable responsible agent (Matthias, 2004). In algorithmic contexts, responsibility is often diffused across institutional and technical layers, allowing each actor to disclaim full accountability.

Legal systems that rely exclusively on individualized responsibility are ill-equipped to address such systemic harms. There is therefore a growing need for models of shared, collective, or layered responsibility that reflect the realities of algorithmic governance (Yeung, 2018).

5. Human Dignity, Due Process, and Algorithmic Decisions

At the normative core of this debate lies the principle of human dignity. Human dignity demands that individuals be treated as subjects of rights rather than objects of calculation. Algorithmic decision-making systems, however, tend to reduce individuals to data profiles, undermining their capacity to understand, contest, or influence decisions affecting them.

This concern resonates strongly with due process guarantees, including the right to a reasoned decision and effective remedy. The jurisprudence of the European Court of Human Rights has consistently emphasized the importance of foreseeability, transparency, and procedural fairness in decision-making processes. These principles must be extended to algorithmic systems if fundamental rights are to remain meaningful in the digital age.

Legal scholars increasingly argue that explainability and contestability are not merely technical features but legal and ethical imperatives (Wachter, Mittelstadt, & Floridi, 2017).

6. Toward Algorithmic Accountability: A Normative Proposal

In response to the limitations of fault-based liability, this article advances the concept of algorithmic accountability as a comprehensive normative framework. Algorithmic accountability shifts the focus from individual blame to systemic responsibility, emphasizing governance, oversight, and institutional design.

Key pillars of algorithmic accountability include:

- Transparency: meaningful access to information about how decisions are made;
- Explainability: the ability to provide intelligible reasons for outcomes;
- Auditability: independent assessment of system performance and bias;
- Remediability: effective mechanisms for redress and correction.

These principles are increasingly reflected in emerging regulatory frameworks, such as the European Union's approach to artificial intelligence governance (Floridi et al., 2018). By embedding accountability into the design and deployment of algorithmic systems, law can reclaim its normative authority in the digital sphere.

Copyright © OXBRIDGE UK - International Journal of Interdisciplinary Research

7. Conclusion: Reconstructing Legal Responsibility in the Age of Algorithmic Governance

The rise of algorithmic decision-making systems marks a structural transformation in the way power, authority, and responsibility are exercised in contemporary societies. This transformation is not merely technological; it is juridical and philosophical at its core. Legal systems developed under the assumption that decisions affecting individuals are made by identifiable human agents endowed with intention, rationality, and moral accountability. Algorithmic governance fundamentally disrupts this assumption by introducing decision-making architectures that operate without consciousness, intention, or moral awareness, yet nonetheless produce binding and often irreversible consequences for individuals.

This article has demonstrated that traditional fault-based liability regimes are increasingly inadequate in addressing algorithmic harms. The insistence on locating responsibility exclusively within human intention risks producing a normative blind spot, where structurally generated injustices escape legal scrutiny. Algorithmic discrimination, exclusion, and arbitrariness are rarely the result of malicious intent; rather, they emerge from data-driven optimization processes that prioritize efficiency, prediction, and risk management over justice and dignity. A legal framework that fails to account for this reality risks normalizing harm through procedural invisibility.

From a normative perspective, the persistence of such blind spots threatens the foundational legitimacy of law itself. Law derives its authority not only from enforceability but from its claim to protect human dignity, ensure fairness, and limit arbitrary power. When algorithmic systems are allowed to operate beyond meaningful legal accountability, individuals are reduced to objects of calculation rather than subjects of rights. This erosion of subjecthood represents a profound constitutional and ethical concern, particularly in democratic societies committed to the rule of law.

The concept of algorithmic accountability, as developed in this study, offers a pathway beyond the limitations of anthropocentric fault models. Rather than seeking to attribute moral blame to machines or to isolate a single culpable actor within complex socio-technical systems, algorithmic accountability reframes responsibility as a systemic obligation. It demands that all actors involved in the design, deployment, and governance of algorithmic systems assume proportionate legal responsibility for the risks they create and the harms they enable.

Crucially, algorithmic accountability must be understood as a legal principle, not merely a regulatory aspiration. Transparency, explainability, auditability, and remediability are not optional design features but normative requirements derived from fundamental rights. The right to understand how a decision is made, the right to contest it, and the right to obtain effective redress are essential components of legal personhood in the digital age. Without these guarantees, procedural justice becomes illusory.

Furthermore, the expansion of algorithmic governance necessitates a shift from reactive to preventive legality. Law must intervene not only after harm has occurred but at the level of system design, data selection, and institutional oversight. This preventive orientation aligns with existing doctrines of risk regulation and objective liability, yet requires their recalibration to address algorithmic complexity. In this sense, algorithmic accountability should be integrated into constitutional principles, administrative law standards, and human rights jurisprudence rather than confined to specialized technology regulation.

Copyright © OXBRIDGE UK - International Journal of Interdisciplinary Research

In conclusion, the challenge posed by algorithmic decision-making systems is not whether law can adapt, but whether it will do so in a manner faithful to its normative foundations. A legal order that tolerates opaque, unchallengeable, and unaccountable decision-making systems risks surrendering its protective function. By reconstructing legal responsibility around human dignity and systemic accountability, law can reclaim its role as a normative counterweight to technological power. The future of legality in the digital age depends not on resisting algorithms, but on subjecting them to the ethical and juridical discipline that justice requires.

References

Binns, R. (2018). Fairness in machine learning: Lessons from political philosophy. Proceedings of the 1st Conference on Fairness, Accountability and Transparency, 149–159.

Citron, D. K., & Pasquale, F. (2014). The scored society: Due process for automated predictions. Washington Law Review, 89(1), 1–33.

Cobbe, J. (2019). Administrative law and the machines of government: Judicial review of automated public-sector decision-making. Legal Studies, 39(4), 636–655. https://doi.org/10.1017/lst.2019.9

De Stefano, V. (2020). Algorithmic management and collective bargaining. Comparative Labor Law & Policy Journal, 41(3), 619–644.

Eubanks, V. (2018). Automating inequality: How high-tech tools profile, police, and punish the poor. St. Martin's Press.

Floridi, L. (2019). The logic of information: A theory of philosophy as conceptual design. Oxford University Press.

Floridi, L., Cowls, J., Beltrametti, M., et al. (2018). AI4People—An ethical framework for a good AI society. Minds and Machines, 28(4), 689–707. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11023-018-9482-5

Hildebrandt, M. (2015). Smart technologies and the end(s) of law: Novel entanglements of law and technology. Edward Elgar. https://doi.org/10.4337/9781784713666

Kroll, J. A., Huey, J., Barocas, S., et al. (2017). Accountable algorithms. University of Pennsylvania Law Review, 165(3), 633–705.

Matthias, A. (2004). The responsibility gap: Ascribing responsibility for the actions of learning automata. Ethics and Information Technology, 6(3), 175–183. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10676-004-3422-1

Mittelstadt, B. D., Allo, P., Taddeo, M., Wachter, S., & Floridi, L. (2016). The ethics of algorithms: Mapping the debate. Big Data & Society, 3(2), 1–21. https://doi.org/10.1177/2053951716679679

O'Neil, C. (2016). Weapons of math destruction: How big data increases inequality and threatens democracy. Crown.

Pasquale, F. (2015). The black box society: The secret algorithms that control money and information. Harvard University Press.

Rouvroy, A., & Berns, T. (2013). Algorithmic governmentality and prospects of emancipation. Réseaux, 177(1), 163–196.

Selbst, A. D., Boyd, D., Friedler, S. A., Venkatasubramanian, S., & Vertesi, J. (2019). Fairness and abstraction in sociotechnical systems. Proceedings of the Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency, 59–68.

Copyright © OXBRIDGE UK - International Journal of Interdisciplinary Research

Wachter, S., Mittelstadt, B., & Floridi, L. (2017). Why a right to explanation of automated decision-making does not exist in the General Data Protection Regulation. International Data Privacy Law, 7(2), 76–99. https://doi.org/10.1093/idpl/ipx005

Yeung, K. (2018). Algorithmic regulation: A critical interrogation. Regulation & Governance, 12(4), 505–523. https://doi.org/10.1111/rego.12158

Zarsky, T. (2016). The trouble with algorithmic decisions: An analytic road map to examine efficiency and fairness in automated and opaque decision making. Science, Technology, & Human Values, 41(1), 118–132. https://doi.org/10.1177/0162243915605575

Copyright © OXBRIDGE UK - International Journal of Interdisciplinary Research

Publication Ethics and Policies

Oxbridge Publishing UK, adheres to internationally recognized standards of publication ethics.

- Plagiarism Policy
All submissions undergo thorough plagiarism screening. Manuscripts with unethical similarity are rejected or returned for revision, ensuring originality and credibility.

- Conflict of Interest
Authors, editors, and reviewers must disclose any potential conflicts of interest to ensure transparency and maintain the integrity and credibility of the publication process.

- Corrections and Retractions
In cases of significant error or ethical violation, corrections or retraction notices are published and permanently linked to the original publication.

- Permanent Access Policy
Published works are maintained with stable URLs. Content removal is avoided; instead, editorial notices are issued where necessary.

Our Promise

Our publishing company is dedicated to supporting high-quality, original, and ethical scholarly work through the publication of academic journals and scholarly e-books. All publications are developed and released in accordance with internationally recognized academic publishing standards.
Our editorial processes are built on rigorous peer review, plagiarism screening, conflict of interest disclosure, and a strong commitment to academic integrity. Each published work is supported by clear and structured metadata, hosted on stable landing pages, and maintained with a long-term commitment to accessibility and preservation.

The reliability, traceability, and sustainability of scholarly content lie at the core of our publishing philosophy. We aim to ensure that every work we publish contributes lasting value to the global scholarly communication ecosystem through visibility, citability, and enduring academic relevance.

Contact

Email: info@oxbridgepublishinguk.com
Office: 2 dickens road Coventry cv6 2jt - United Kingdom
Message Center: https://bit.ly/44Pms6e
Web: www.oxbridgepublishinguk.com
Editor-in-chief: Asst. Prof. Dr. Ferhat Atik - ferhatatik@me.com

GOV.UK
We are an inclusive workplace. Please email us about any adjustments you may need.

Copyright © OXBRIDGE UK - International Journal of Interdisciplinary Research

ACADEMIC JOURNAL VOL.1.0- ISSUE 1

OXBRIDGE®

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF INTERDISCIPLINARY RESEARCH

A COMMON GROUND FOR INTERDISCIPLINARY SCHOLARSHIP

Copyright © OXBRIDGE UK - International Journal of Interdisciplinary Research